DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 100 197 HE 006 090

AUTHOR El-Khawas, Elaine H.; Furniss, W. Todd
TITLE Faculty Tenure and Contract Systems: 1972 and 1974. Report No. 22.
INSTITUTION American Council on Education, Washington, D.C. Higher Education Panel.
PUB DATE Dec 74
NOTE 35p.
AVAILABLE FROM Higher Education Panel, American Council on Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; *Contracts; *Higher Education; *Probationary Period; Statistical Data; Teacher Employment; Teacher Welfare; *Tenure

ABSTRACT

This survey of faculty tenure and contract systems was conducted during August 1974 as a followup to an earlier Higher Education Panel survey of institutional policies and practices affecting faculty employment. A survey questionnaire mailed to the entire membership of the Higher Education Panel (644 institutions) received a 91 percent response rate. Highlights of the survey indicated: (1) There has been no overall change between 1972 and 1974 in the general prevalence of tenure systems. (2) Between 1972 and 1974, there was an upward shift in the percentage of full-time faculty holding tenure. (3) As compared to 1972 data, somewhat fewer of those faculty formally considered for tenure in 1973-74 actually received tenure. (4) Two-thirds of the institutions with tenure systems reported that they had renewed 80 percent or more of their term contracts expiring during the 1973-74 academic year. (5) Of the institutions operating under term-contract systems in 1973-74, almost all (93 percent) had reappointed 90 percent or more of their faculty. (6) As in 1972, almost all tenure institutions have probationary periods, and 2-year institutions reported shorter maximum periods of probation than did 4-year colleges and universities. (7) There is some shift toward longer probationary periods of tenure. Additional results and statistical data are provided. (MJM)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Faculty Tenure and Contract Systems: 1972 and 1974

Elaine H. El-Khawas and W. Todd Furniss

ED 100197

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 006 090

HIGHER EDUCATION PANEL REPORTS, NUMBER 22
AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

DECEMBER
1974

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

Roger W. Heyns, *President*

The American Council on Education, founded in 1918, is a council of educational organizations and institutions. Its purpose is to advance education and educational methods through comprehensive voluntary and cooperative action on the part of American educational associations, organizations, and institutions.

The Higher Education Panel is a survey research program established by the Council for the purpose of securing policy-related information quickly from representative samples of colleges and universities. *Higher Education Panel Reports* are designed to expedite communication of the Panel's survey findings to policy-makers in government, in the associations, and in educational institutions across the nation.

The Higher Education Panel's surveys on behalf of the Federal Government are conducted under grant support provided jointly by the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, and the U.S. Office of Education (NSF Grant GR-99).

STAFF OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION PANEL

Frank Atelsek, *Panel Director*

Paula R. Knepper, *Programmer*

Gloria Walker, *Project Secretary*

HEP ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Lyle H. Lanier, Director, Office of Administrative Affairs and Educational Statistics, ACE, *Chairman*

John A. Creager, Director, Division of Educational Statistics, ACE

W. Todd Furniss, Director, Office of Academic Affairs, ACE

John F. Hughes, Director, Policy Analysis Service, ACE

Charles V. Kidd, Executive Secretary, Association of American Universities

J. Boyd Page, President, Council of Graduate Schools in the United States

FEDERAL ADVISORY BOARD

Charles E. Falk, National Science Foundation, *Chairman*
Robert R. Trumble, National Institutes of Health
Paul D. Planchon, Office of Management and Budget
Richard T. Sonnergren, U.S. Office of Education
Felix H. Lindsay, National Science Foundation, *Secretary*

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE FEDERAL ADVISORY BOARD

Martin Frankel, U.S. Office of Education, *Chairman*
Nancy M. Conlon, National Science Foundation
Tavia Gordon, National Institutes of Health

Additional copies of this report are available from the Higher Education Panel, American Council on Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036.

HIGHLIGHTS

Extent of Tenure

- There has been no overall change between 1972 and 1974 in the general prevalence of tenure systems. Tenure systems are nearly universal among universities and four-year colleges and are found in about two-thirds of two-year institutions (Table 1). Of the institutions utilizing term or contract systems of faculty appointment, very few (2.5 percent) reported any plans to establish a tenure system (Table 3, Item 7c).

- Between 1972 and 1974, there has been an upward shift in the percentage of full-time faculty holding tenure. By 1974, 59 percent of those institutions with tenure systems reported that half or more of their full-time faculty held tenure (compared to 43 percent in 1972) (Table 2, Item 4).

Tenure Awards and Contract Renewals

- As compared to 1972 data, somewhat fewer of those faculty formally considered for tenure in 1973-74 actually received tenure. Percentage differences were small, however (Table 2, Item 2f).

- Two-thirds of the institutions with tenure systems reported that they had renewed 80 percent or more of their term contracts expiring during the 1973-74 academic year (other than those whose renewal would confer tenure) (Table 2, Item 2e).

- Of the institutions operating under term-contract systems in 1973-74, almost all (93 percent) had reappointed 90 percent or more of their faculty (Table 3, Item 7b).

Probationary Periods Under Tenure Systems

- As in 1972, almost all tenure institutions have probationary periods, and two-year institutions reported shorter maximum periods for probation than did four-year colleges and universities (Table 2, Item 2a).

- There is some shift toward longer probationary periods for tenure. Four-year colleges and universities, particularly those under public control, showed the greatest amount of change (Table 2, Item 2b).

- In 1974, contracts during the probationary period were still typically for terms of one year. However, a small shift can be noted toward two- or three-year contracts, primarily at four-year institutions (Table 2, Item 2d).

- Four-year colleges also reported an increase in the number of years of prior service creditable to the probationary period (Table 2, Item 2c).

Review and Appeal Procedures

- A third of institutions with tenure systems had made changes in their review policies during the last two years. Further reviews of tenure systems were currently underway, particularly among public universities (Table 2, Item 6).

- As was true in 1972, close to half of all institutions always provided written reasons to a faculty member when tenure was denied or a contract was not renewed. Only a small proportion never gave written reasons (Table 4, Item 8).

- In 1972, procedures for appealing adverse decisions had been available at almost all institutions with tenure systems, but at few institutions with contract systems. By 1974, most contract institutions -- especially the private four-year colleges and public two-year colleges -- had modified their procedures to allow faculty members to appeal adverse contract decisions (Table 4, Item 9a).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This survey was conducted during August 1974 as a followup to an earlier Higher Education Panel survey (Spring 1972) of institutional policies and practices affecting faculty employment. Results of the first survey were printed in "Faculty Tenure and Contract Systems: Current Practice," (ACE Special Report, July 27, 1972). The data were also used extensively in Faculty Tenure, the report of the Commission on Academic Tenure (Jossey-Bass, 1973).

In its report, the Commission on Academic Tenure recommended that followup surveys be conducted to document changes in institutional policies and practices concerning faculty tenure and contracts. The Lilly Endowment provided partial funding for the collection and processing of the current survey data.

We wish to acknowledge the substantial assistance provided by M. Storme Smithers in preparation of this report. Paula R. Knepper efficiently directed all data-processing tasks.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Introduction	1
II.	Nature of Survey	1
III.	Summary of Findings	2
IV.	Interpretation	8
V.	Tables	11
VI.	Appendixes	23

Appendix A: Sampling and Weighting Procedures
Appendix B: 1974 Survey Questionnaire

Introduction

During August of 1974, the Higher Education Panel conducted a survey of the characteristics of current faculty tenure and contract systems. This survey, conducted at the request of ACE's Office of Academic Affairs with partial support from the Lilly Endowment, was a sequel to an earlier HEP survey conducted in April 1972 and repeated most of the items on the first questionnaire.[1] Together, the survey results provide a basis for assessing changes that have occurred in tenure and contract systems over the past two years.

Nature of the Survey

The survey questionnaire was mailed to the entire membership of the Higher Education Panel, currently including 644 institutions broadly representative of colleges and universities across the country. Responses were received from 586 institutions (or 91 percent). Each respondent was asked to indicate whether his institution used a tenure or a term-appointment (contract) system, and to answer a variety of questions concerning the characteristics and operation of the existing system. All responses were statistically weighted in order to provide national estimates appropriate to the entire population of colleges and universities in the United States. Information on the sampling and weighting procedures and a copy of the questionnaire may be found in Appendixes A and B.

---

[1] W. T. Furniss, "Faculty Tenure and Contract Systems: Current Practice," ACE Special Report, July 27, 1972. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

The weighted data results have been organized into seven major reporting categories according to institutional type and control. Survey findings, expressed as percentages, are presented for the following:

1. public universities
2. private universities
3. public four-year colleges
4. private four-year colleges
5. public two-year colleges
6. private two-year colleges
7. all institutions

Table A2 (Appendix A) shows the distribution of respondents among these categories.

Comparisons with the results of the 1972 survey are presented wherever appropriate. Data in the earlier survey were based on largely similar questionnaire items and parallel weighting and reporting procedures. Where question wording differs on the two surveys, both the 1972 and the 1974 question items are printed verbatim in the tables.

Summary of Findings

The tabulations in this report present data separately for institutions with tenure systems (Items 2-6, 8-9) and for the small set of institutions with contract systems (Items 7, 8-9). Data are presented in item order, keyed numerically to the items on the questionnaire.

Extent of Tenure Systems

There has been no overall change between 1972 and 1974 in the general prevalence of tenure systems (Table 1). As reported earlier, tenure systems are nearly universal among universities and four-year colleges and are found in about two-thirds of two-year institutions.

A. RESPONSES OF INSTITUTIONS WITH TENURE SYSTEMS

Probationary Periods under Tenure Systems

The 1974 survey again reflects the earlier finding that almost all tenure institutions have probationary periods and that two-year institutions set shorter maximum periods for probation than do four-year colleges and universities (Table 2, Items 2a and 2b).

There is some shift, however, toward longer probationary periods. Four-year colleges and universities, particularly those under public control, showed the greatest amount of change (Table 2, Item 2b).

- As compared to 29 percent in 1972, almost 50 percent of public four-year colleges reported in 1974 that their maximum probationary periods were seven or more years.
- At public universities, the proportion reporting maximum periods of seven years or longer increased from 44 percent in 1972 to 57 percent in 1974.

A sharply increased proportion of four-year colleges reported in 1974 that the probationary period could be reduced by credit for prior service at other educational institutions (Table 2, Item 2c).

- In 1974, 57 percent of public four-year colleges and 77 percent of private four-year colleges accepted prior service as part of the probationary period; the comparable figures in 1972 had been 31 percent and 59 percent, respectively.
- Other types of institutions showed little change from 1972. As before, two-thirds of universities accepted prior service, typically for a maximum of three or four years.
- Conversely, two-thirds or more of two-year colleges, which as a group have shorter probationary periods, did not grant credit for prior service at other institutions.

In 1974, contracts during the probationary period were still typically for terms of one year. However, a small shift can be noted toward two- or three-year contracts, primarily at four-year institutions (Table 2, Item 2d).

- At public four-year colleges, the proportion granting initial contracts of one year dropped from 94 percent in 1972 to 79 percent in 1974.

- A similar decrease, from 91 percent to 83 percent, took place at private four-year colleges.

In response to a new question, most institutions with tenure systems replied that 80 percent or more of their term contracts expiring during the 1973-74 academic year had been renewed (i.e. contracts other than those whose renewal would confer tenure).

- About three-quarters of two-year colleges, two-thirds of four-year colleges and only about half of universities reported this level of contract renewal (Table 2, Item 2e).

- In contrast, 11 percent of private universities reported that only 21 to 40 percent of expiring contracts had been renewed.

- The high "no response" rate in some categories in Items 2e and 2f should be considered in interpreting these tables, however. Removing the "no response" institutions will raise the percentages in each column, but does not significantly alter the trends from 1971 to 1974.

Tenure awards during 1973-1974

Comparisons of responses about the award of tenure in the two survey periods indicate that fewer of those faculty formally considered for tenure in 1973-74 actually received tenure (Table 2, Item 2f).

- Somewhat fewer institutions (37 percent in 1973-74 versus 42 percent in Spring 1971) granted tenure to all faculty members who were considered for tenure.

- Among universities and four-year colleges (but not among two-year colleges), increased proportions of institutions reported that as few as 20 to 60 percent of those faculty who were reviewed actually received tenure. The greatest change occurred among private universities.

- A number of institutions (7 percent overall) volunteered that no faculty were considered for tenure during 1973-74; other institutions might have given this response if it had been an option on the questionnaire.

Institutions showed little change in their use of the conventional faculty-rank system and in their policies toward awarding tenure to faculty at different ranks. Several small differences can be noted, however (Table 2, Items 3a and 3b).

- The percentage of private two-year colleges using faculty ranks -- already lower than that of most other institutions in 1972 -- decreased further by 1974. Only 33 percent of the private two-year colleges with tenure systems had ranked faculties in summer 1974.

- As compared to 1972, an increased percentage of public universities reported in 1974 that assistant professors could hold tenure.

- Slight increases were also reported, for particular types of institutions, in the eligibility of instructors for tenure.

Data from the two surveys document an upward shift in the percentage of full-time faculty holding tenure (Table 2, Item 4).

- In 1972, the median institution reported that between 41 and 50 percent of the faculty were tenured. In 1974, the median response moved to between 51 and 60 percent.

- By 1974, as a result, 59 percent of all institutions reported that half or more of their full-time faculty held tenure (compared to 43 percent in 1972).

- A markedly increased proportion of public two-year colleges reported that 70 percent or more of their full-time faculty held tenure. 52 percent reported this level in 1974, up from the already substantial 28 percent reported in 1972.

Limitations on the Percentage of Tenured Faculty

Despite differences in question wording, the data provide some indication of an increased use of a formal goal or numerical limit on the percentage of tenured faculty (Table 2, Item 5a).

- In 1972, 6 percent of all institutions reported limits on the percentage of tenured faculty. In 1974, with a more restrictively worded question, nine percent of institutions responded that they have a formally announced limitation on tenure. Increases appear in all institutional categories except four-year public colleges.

- Private institutions more often reported such limits than did public institutions.

- In general, the limitation on tenure takes the form of a fixed percentage (Table 2, Item 5b). Low numbers of respondents on the item prevent any detailed conclusions.

Recent Changes in Tenure Policies

A good number of institutions had made changes in their tenure policies during the last two years. Further reviews were currently underway, particularly among public universities (Table 2, Items 6a and 6b).

- Between Spring 1972 and Spring 1974, a small proportion of institutions lengthened their period of probation for tenure. Public two-year colleges were the only type of institution with a good number that shortened the probationary period.
- Fully a third of institutions had altered their review procedures with regard to tenure during the same period
- In addition, a third of all institutions reported that their tenure systems were currently under review. The proportion was higher among public universities (47 percent) and lower among public two-year colleges (17 percent).

B. RESPONSES OF INSTITUTIONS WITH CONTRACT SYSTEMS

As in the earlier survey, a small proportion of two-year colleges (public and private) and private four-year colleges reported operating under term-appointment or contract systems. No universities or public four-year colleges appeared in this group.

- From a 1972 norm of one-year contracts, there has been a small shift toward longer contracts. This was true with both initial and succeeding contracts (Table 3, Item 7a).
- Most institutions continued to reappoint 90 percent or more of their faculty. Specific changes can be noted, in that fewer private four-year colleges renewed all contracts while an increased proportion of public two-year colleges did so.
- Among private two-year colleges, there were no responses of less than 80 percent renewal in the 1974 survey, although 23 percent had reported lower renewal rates in 1972 (Table 3, Item 7b).
- In 1972, 14 percent of contract institutions were planning to establish tenure systems. In 1974, only 2.5 percent were planning to do so (Table 3, Item 7c).

C. RESPONSES OF BOTH TYPES OF INSTITUTIONS

Procedures for Appealing Adverse Decisions

As was true in 1972, close to half of all institutions always provide written reasons to a faculty member when tenure is denied or a contract is not renewed. Only a small proportion never give written reasons. Changes since 1972 occurred mainly among certain types of institutions (Table 4, Item 8).

- In 1972, the majority of contract institutions always gave written reasons when a contract was not renewed; in 1974, the proportion doing so increased, primarily among public two-year colleges.
- Substantial percentages of tenure-granting public four-year colleges and private two-year colleges appear to have moved from always giving reasons to sometimes.
- Despite little overall change, certain types of tenure institutions showed small increases in the proportion never giving written reasons for denial of tenure.

In 1972, procedures for appealing adverse decisions were available at almost all institutions with tenure systems but at very few institutions with contract systems. By 1974, contract institutions -- at least almost all private four-year colleges and public two-year colleges in the category -- had modified their procedures in order to allow faculty members to appeal adverse contract decisions (Table 4, Items 9a and 9b).

- Comparisons between the surveys suggest that appeal procedures have been used more often in recent years; this appears to be the case at public four-year colleges, at private universities and, most markedly, at public universities.
- For the earlier period (September 1969 to April 1972), 27 percent of public universities reported that four or more appeals had been filed. In contrast, 60 percent of public universities reported that appeals procedures had been used four or more times during the period between September 1972 and August 1974.
- Institutions with contract systems also reported a somewhat increased use of appeals procedures. Fewer contract institutions reported no appeals, and a much increased proportion reported that two, three or more appeals had been filed.

Collective Bargaining Contracts

The questionnaires for both surveys included an item on collective bargaining. Relatively few institutions indicated that they had a collective bargaining agent or contract in either year although, as expected, some increase did take place. Because of the small number of institutions on which the survey data are based, detailed presentations have not been given for these responses. Recent nationwide counts are available from the Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service, however. As of mid-October 1974, there were 232 institutions of higher education, with 342 campuses, where faculty had chosen bargaining agents. A total of 279 institutions, with 189 campuses, had bargaining contracts in effect as of that time.[2]

Interpretation

Many of the 43 percent of institutions that reported their tenure systems under review for change in 1972 appear to have completed their work while others have since begun such a review (Table 2, Item 6c). The policy alterations seem to provide somewhat different approaches to untenured faculty members already on board at the time of change and those to be appointed thereafter. It may be inferred from the continued rise in percentages of tenured faculty (Table 2, Item 4), from the absence of steep declines in the award of tenure (Table 2, Item 2f), and from a relatively high rate of contract renewal in 1973-74 (Table 2, Item 2e), that institutions have "grandfathered" their probationary faculty even at the risk of higher percentages of tenured staff. But for new appointees the probationary periods have been increased (Table 2, Items 2b and 6a) and a small but perhaps significant number of institutions have adopted limitations on the allowable percentage of tenured faculty (Table 2, Item 5a). Offsetting the possibly

[2]Taken from an October 1974 bulletin of the Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service.

adverse effects of these measures on individual faculty members, institutions are today more likely to consider instructors and assistant professors eligible for tenure without promotion to a higher rank (Table 2, Item 3b), and (particularly in public four-year colleges) the lengthening of the probationary period may be accompanied by an increase in the number of years of prior service creditable toward that period (Table 2, Items 2b and 2c).

The faculty member denied tenure or contract renewal is more likely today than in 1972 to have a formal appeals procedure to use (Table 4, Item 9a), although somewhat less likely to be able to base an appeal upon a statement of reasons given automatically at the time of notification (Table 4, Item 8). Although the number of times such appeals procedures have been used seems to have increased in most institutional categories (Table 4, Item 9b), the increase is modest and does not necessarily reflect an increase in the length or cost of litigation; in fact, it may suggest a desirable reduction in both of these as good procedures replace inadequate ones.

Comparable trends can be noted among the small number of institutions with contract systems. The exception is a turn toward longer initial or succeeding contracts in some institutions (Table 3, Item 7a), providing somewhat more job security than in the past.

Looking to the future, it seems likely that in tenure institutions the modification of the tenure system will most seriously affect newer faculty members seeking permanency of employment. Those institutions with a high percentage of tenured faculty will -- until that percentage drops with time and attrition -- have few vacancies for initial appointments, although the chance of tenure for a new appointee may be reasonably good. Institutions with moderate percentages, but with policies controlling substantial increases, will offer more positions to new faculty, but greater competition for permanency. These contrasting

situations suggest that in a future survey the first type of institution may report close to 100 percent of those eligible being granted tenure and the second type fewer than 50 percent.

The data suggest that the well-publicized experience of a few institutions in 1973-74 taking emergency measures to reduce faculty positions for financial exigency has not yet been characteristic of the large majority; many institutions have apparently been able to anticipate difficulties and take more moderate steps to meet them. Whether the steps will prove to be effective in every case remains to be seen, but there is considerable evidence that recent revisions of tenure and contract systems have resulted in many policy and procedural clarifications beneficial to both faculty members and institutions.

TABLES

1972 and 1974 Surveys on

Faculty Tenure and Contract Systems

TABLE 1

RESPONSES OF ALL INSTITUTIONS: ITEM 1
(STATED IN PERCENTAGES)

ITEM	August 1974 Survey UNIVERSITIES Public	Private	COLLEGES Public 4-Year	Private 4-Year	Public 2-Year	Private 2-Year	ALL INSTITUTIONS	ITEM	April 1972 Survey UNIVERSITIES Public	Private	COLLEGES Public 4-Year	Private 4-Year	Public 2-Year	Private 2-Year	ALL INSTITUTIONS
ITEM 1: A full-time faculty member may be granted tenure at this institution															
Yes	100.0	100.0	100.0	93.2	66.9	65.7	84.5	Yes	100.0	100.0	100.0	94.1	68.3	68.2	84.9

19 69

TABLE 2

RESPONSES OF INSTITUTIONS WITH TENURE SYSTEMS: ITEMS 2-6
(STATED IN PERCENTAGES)

ITEM	August 1974 Survey: UNIVERSITIES Public	UNIVERSITIES Private	COLLEGES Public 4-Year	COLLEGES Private 4-Year	COLLEGES Public 2-Year	COLLEGES Private 2-Year	ALL INSTITUTIONS	ITEM	April 1972 Survey: UNIVERSITIES Public	UNIVERSITIES Private	COLLEGES Public 4-Year	COLLEGES Private 4-Year	COLLEGES Public 2-Year	COLLEGES Private 2-Year	ALL INSTITUTIONS
ITEM 2a: This institution has a probationary period for tenure															
Yes	100.0	100.0	99.4	98.3	100.0	100.0	99.1		Not in 1972 survey						
ITEM 2b: Maximum length of probationary period for tenure															
1 year	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.5	0.0	1.1	1 year	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.5	4.4	0.0	1.6
2 years	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.3	0.0	3.9	2 years	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	4.0	0.0	1.2
3 years	1.[illegible]	0.0	3.9	3.3	25.0	9.8	8.8	3 years	7.8	6.5	3.9	6.2	39.4	22.2	15.4
4 years	4.9	0.0	2.6	2.0	18.1	6.3	6.2	4 years	7.8	0.0	12.1	4.5	17.5	10.8	9.5
5 years	9.7	4.1	19.8	14.2	12.8	37.6	15.9	5 years	28.9	9.7	24.4	18.1	15.1	20.4	19.0
6 years	27.0	21.6	23.9	23.1	4.5	18.8	18.6	6 years	11.7	16.1	28.7	20.7	0.0	14.4	15.7
7 years	54.9	65.3	43.9	51.6	18.1	27.5	41.3	7 years	36.7	64.5	27.5	47.5	17.5	32.3	35.5
8 years	2.2	1.8	5.9	4.2	0.8	0.0	3.3	8 years	7.0	3.2	1.4	1.5	2.0	0.0	1.9
9 or more years	0.0	7.2	0.0	1.[illegible]	0.0	0.0	1.0	9 years	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.2
ITEM 2c: Maximum number of years of prior service accepted as part of the probationary period															
No policy	12.1	9.8	4.2	7.3	0.9	9.0	5.7		No available data						
None	34.4	34.0	42.7	22.9	76.3	66.2	41.4	No policy	32.8	37.9	69.4	40.8	69.7	73.7	54.7
1 year	1.2	0.0	0.7	2.1	0.0	0.0	1.2	None	0.0	0.0	3.7	0.3	2.4	2.4	1.5
2 years	5.0	3.7	3.7	5.9	0.0	0.0	3.8	1 year	5.6	0.0	7.0	6.5	6.4	0.0	5.8
3 years	34.6	40.9	28.0	37.2	16.9	12.4	29.6	2 years	40.8	48.3	9.8	35.5	17.2	10.8	25.5
4 years	10.1	7.9	6.8	15.6	4.0	2.6	10.3	3 years	13.6	3.4	2.2	11.1	4.4	10.8	7.9
5 or more years	2.7	3.7	13.9	9.0	2.0	9.8	8.0	4 years	7.2	10.3	7.8	5.8	0.0	2.4	4.6

TABLE 2 (Continued)

ITEM	August 1974 Survey: UNIVERSITIES Public	UNIVERSITIES Private	COLLEGES Public 4-Year	COLLEGES Private 4-Year	COLLEGES Public 2-Year	COLLEGES Private 2-Year	ALL INSTITUTIONS	April 1972 Survey: ITEM	UNIVERSITIES Public	UNIVERSITIES Private	COLLEGES Public 4-Year	COLLEGES Private 4-Year	COLLEGES Public 2-Year	COLLEGES Private 2-Year	ALL INSTITUTIONS
ITEM 2d: Typical length of contracts awarded a faculty member during the probationary period															
First Contract								First Contract							
1 year	69.5	63.2	78.8	83.2	100.0	100.0	86.3	1 year	65.4	64.5	93.5	90.6	98.0	100.0	91.0
2 years	12.3	11.2	15.1	10.2	0.0	0.0	8.1	2 years	18.0	3.2	5.1	6.2	0.0	0.0	4.6
3 or more years	18.2	25.6	6.1	6.6	0.0	0.0	5.5	3 or more years	15.6	32.3	1.4	3.3	2.0	0.0	3.8
Succeeding contracts								Succeeding contracts							
None	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.7	0.0	1.1	None			No available data				
1 year	66.5	64.1	77.3	71.0	88.8	100.0	77.8	1 year	64.0	61.3	94.9	84.0	96.0	91.6	87.5
2 years	14.9	9.7	18.4	17.0	0.0	0.0	11.9	2 years	18.0	3.2	0.0	9.2	2.0	0.0	5.5
3 years	18.5	21.8	2.8	11.5	3.5	0.0	8.7	3 years	12.5	35.5	5.1	5.7	0.0	8.4	5.6
4 or more years	0.0	4.3	1.4	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.5	4 or more years	5.5	0.0	0.0	1.2	2.0	0.0	1.3
ITEM 2e: Approximately what percent of renewable contracts (other than those in 2f) expiring during the academic year 1973-74 were renewed?															
0	1.1	0.0	0.0	1.1	2.3	3.3	1.3	Not in 1972 survey							
1-20	3.5	0.0	2.4	4.2	0.0	0.0	2.5								
21-40	0.0	11.0	0.6	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.8								
41-60	5.6	1.8	2.9	5.7	0.0	0.0	3.4								
61-80	15.1	18.5	10.3	12.6	6.0	14.4	11.0								
81-90	19.8	24.7	15.0	26.7	7.7	19.8	19.4								
91-99	22.2	26.0	30.2	16.5	29.4	18.3	22.5								
100	3.4	4.0	17.3	21.6	40.5	35.5	25.0								
None renewable	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0								
No response	27.9	14.1	21.3	10.7	14.2	8.7	14.0								

TABLE 2 (Continued)

ITEM	August 1974 Survey: UNIVERSITIES Public	UNIVERSITIES Private	COLLEGES Public 4-Year	COLLEGES Private 4-Year	COLLEGES Public 2-Year	COLLEGES Private 2-Year	ALL INSTITUTIONS
ITEM 2f: Approximately what percent of those faculty members formally considered for tenure in the academic year 1973-74 actually received tenure?							
0	0.0	0.0	1.0	4.6	4.3	5.6	3.7
1-20	4.7	5.7	5.2	2.8	1.7	17.5	4.1
21-40	3.6	12.8	5.4	6.7	0.0	0.0	4.5
41-60	12.3	22.0	9.6	16.3	0.0	3.3	10.4
61-80	30.6	30.8	18.9	17.3	8.3	0.0	15.2
81-99	27.8	22.9	27.8	6.2	13.2	0.0	12.5
100	3.6	2.2	16.7	35.5	66.0	31.4	37.0
None considered	0.0	0.0	6.2	7.7	0.0	11.1	5.3
No response	17.3	3.5	9.2	3.0	6.6	31.1	7.4
ITEM 3a: Is your faculty ranked or unranked?							
Ranked	100.0	100.0	100.0	98.5	51.7	33.2	83.5
Unranked	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	48.3	66.8	16.5
ITEM 3b: In what ranks may tenure be held?							
Professor	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Assoc. Prof.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Asst. Prof.	84.7	63.0	89.6	73.6	100.0	73.7	81.0
Instructor	38.5	26.4	51.8	17.1	63.0	40.3	33.0
Other	10.7	5.7	6.0	0.4	17.4	0.0	4.6

ITEM	April 1972 Survey: UNIVERSITIES Public	UNIVERSITIES Private	COLLEGES Public 4-Year	COLLEGES Private 4-Year	COLLEGES Public 2-Year	COLLEGES Private 2-Year	ALL INSTITUTIONS
What percent of those faculty members considered for tenure in the spring of 1971 actually received tenure?							
0	0.0	0.0	9.3	12.5	2.4	16.8	8.7
1-20	4.6	6.4	3.7	3.8	0.0	3.0	2.9
21-40	0.0	6.4	2.0	2.8	0.0	2.4	1.9
41-60	5.5	6.5	3.6	9.2	6.8	2.4	6.9
61-80	15.7	22.6	17.9	18.3	13.5	10.8	16.4
81-99	29.7	25.8	25.8	5.0	18.8	2.4	13.5
100	14.8	9.7	32.3	41.0	54.2	62.3	42.1
None considered	No available data						
No response	29.7	22.6	5.3	7.5	4.4	0.0	7.5
Ranked	100.0	100.0	100.0	95.4	47.8	50.9	81.4
Unranked	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.6	52.2	49.1	18.6
Professor	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Assoc. Prof.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Asst. Prof.	89.5	58.1	89.8	83.7	100.0	78.8	85.2
Instructor	43.0	19.4	41.8	22.7	50.0	52.9	33.3
Other	7.8	6.0	12.2	1.0	22.5	0.0	6.8

TABLE 2 (Continued)

ITEM	August 1974 Survey UNIVERSITIES Public	Private	COLLEGES Public 4-Year	Private 4-Year	Public 2-Year	Private 2-Year	ALL INSTITUTIONS
ITEM 4: Percentage of full-time faculty with tenure							
1-20	0.0	0.0	2.0	6.9	5.7	2.6	5.0
21-30	0.0	0.0	7.1	5.2	1.7	17.5	5.2
31-40	3.5	0.0	8.1	12.6	10.9	8.7	10.5
41-50	12.0	16.7	14.6	19.7	14.0	8.7	16.4
51-60	39.4	53.3	22.7	28.7	6.0	4.6	21.8
61-70	30.2	24.2	24.7	13.1	9.3	18.0	15.5
71-80	9.4	5.7	13.7	10.3	18.6	2.3	12.1
81-90	2.2	0.0	2.4	1.0	21.9	2.3	6.2
91-100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.9	8.7	3.4
No response	3.3	0.0	4.8	2.5	0.0	26.4	3.9
ITEM 5a: This institution has formally announced a goal or a numerical limit for the percentage of tenured faculty							
Yes	7.1	10.1	5.9	12.2	4.6	15.7	9.3
ITEM 5b: The limit is expressed as							
A fixed percentage	28.6	42.9	66.7	51.7	50.0	84.6	55.9
A range of percentages	14.3	42.9	0.0	35.0	0.0	15.4	24.4
Numerically unspecified	28.6	14.3	22.2	12.6	50.0	0.0	17.2
No response	28.6	0.0	11.1	0.7	0.0	0.0	2.5

ITEM	April 1972 Survey UNIVERSITIES Public	Private	COLLEGES Public 4-Year	Private 4-Year	Public 2-Year	Private 2-Year	ALL INSTITUTIONS
0	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.3	2.0	8.4	1.4
1-20	0.0	0.0	3.3	8.3	15.1	3.0	8.1
21-30	4.7	3.2	13.3	8.7	17.9	19.2	12.1
31-40	13.3	0.0	17.2	14.6	6.8	29.9	13.7
41-50	28.9	32.3	23.0	28.1	2.0	13.8	19.9
51-60	25.0	38.7	16.1	17.2	21.5	7.8	18.4
61-70	15.6	19.4	23.3	12.6	6.4	2.4	12.4
71-80	5.5	0.0	1.9	4.3	13.1	13.2	6.7
81-90	0.0	0.0	1.9	3.0	11.1	2.4	4.5
91-100	0.0	3.2	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	1.1
No response	4.7	3.2	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	1.6
Does your institution limit the percent of tenured faculty?							
Yes	5.5	6.5	7.5	9.5	0.0	2.4	5.9

Not in 1972 survey

TABLE 2 (Continued)

ITEM	August 1974 Survey: UNIVERSITIES Public	UNIVERSITIES Private	COLLEGES Public 4-Year	COLLEGES Private 4-Year	COLLEGES Public 2-Year	COLLEGES Private 2-Year	ALL INSTITUTIONS	ITEM	April 1972 Survey: UNIVERSITIES Public	UNIVERSITIES Private	COLLEGES Public 4-Year	COLLEGES Private 4-Year	COLLEGES Public 2-Year	COLLEGES Private 2-Year	ALL INSTITUTIONS
ITEM 6a: Between Spring 1972 and Spring 1974, the probationary period for tenure has been															
Shortened	1.2	1.8	2.9	2.1	11.5	0.0	4.3								
Lengthened	14.5	15.0	15.2	14.6	7.2	18.4	13.2		Not in 1972 survey						
Not changed	84.4	83.3	81.9	83.3	81.2	81.6	82.5								
ITEM 6b: In the same period, have the tenure review procedures been altered?															
Yes	36.8	34.8	38.1	36.8	22.3	39.2	33.8		Not in 1972 survey						
ITEM 6c: Is the tenure system currently under review for change on your campus?															
Yes	47.0	28.7	36.8	39.5	17.0	36.2	33.6	Yes	48.4	41.9	36.6	54.1	28.6	40.1	43.2

TABLE 3

RESPONSES OF INSTITUTIONS WITH CONTRACT SYSTEMS: ITEM 7
(STATED IN PERCENTAGES)

August 1974 Survey					April 1972 Survey				
ITEM	Private 4-Year Colleges	Public 2-Year Colleges	Private 2-Year Colleges	TOTAL	ITEM	Private 4-Year Colleges	Public 2-Year Colleges	Private 2-Year Colleges	TOTAL
ITEM 7a: What has been the typical length of contracts?									
First contract					First contract				
1 year	94.1	90.1	100.0	92.9	1 year	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
2 years	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0					
3 or more years	5.9	9.9	0.0	7.1					
Succeeding contracts					Succeeding contracts				
1 year	62.2	73.7	62.1	69.1	1 year	71.2	100.0	100.0	95.7
2 years	0.0	11.0	0.0	6.6	2 years	8.5	0.0	0.0	1.3
3 years	6.0	11.0	37.9	16.2	3 years	20.3	0.0	0.0	3.1
4 years	2.4	4.3	0.0	3.0					
5 or more years	29.4	0.0	0.0	5.1					
ITEM 7b: What percentage of those faculty whose contracts expired during the 1973-74 academic year were renewed?					What percentage of those faculty whose contracts expired in 1971 were renewed?				
0-20					0-20	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
21-40					21-40	0.0	0.0	5.1	1.0
41-60					41-60	0.0	0.0	17.9	3.6
61-80					61-80	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
81-90	17.9	0.0	20.1	6.7	81-90	8.5	9.4	6.4	8.7
91-99	32.0	45.4	46.8	43.1	91-99	25.4	83.5	34.6	65.0
100	50.1	54.6	33.1	50.2	100	66.1	7.1	35.9	21.7
ITEM 7c: Is your institution planning to establish a tenure system?									
Yes	9.6	1.6	0.0	2.5	Yes	28.8	14.6	0.0	13.8

TABLE 4

RESPONSES OF ALL INSTITUTIONS, BY TYPE OF SYSTEM: ITEMS 8-9
(STATED IN PERCENTAGES)

ITEM	August 1974 Survey: UNIVERSITIES Public	UNIVERSITIES Private	COLLEGES Public 4-Year	COLLEGES Private 4-Year	COLLEGES Public 2-Year	COLLEGES Private 2-Year	ALL INSTITUTIONS	April 1972 Survey: UNIVERSITIES Public	UNIVERSITIES Private	COLLEGES Public 4-Year	COLLEGES Private 4-Year	COLLEGES Public 2-Year	COLLEGES Private 2-Year	ALL INSTITUTIONS
ITEM 8: Does your institution give formal, written reasons to a faculty member who was denied tenure or whose contract (probationary or recurring term appointment) was not renewed?								Does your institution give written reasons to the faculty member concerned for nonrenewal of contracts (probationary or recurring term appointments) or for denial of tenure?						
All institutions														
Never	20.0	24.3	21.8	16.8	12.6	19.7	16.8	13.3	19.4	26.9	14.5	14.0	0.0	14.7
Sometimes	48.9	56.3	59.2	43.0	16.3	55.2	38.8	50.8	61.3	34.9	46.9	18.0	58.8	38.0
Always	31.1	19.4	18.9	40.2	71.1	25.1	44.4	35.9	19.4	38.2	38.5	68.1	41.2	47.3
Institutions with tenure systems														
Never	20.0	24.3	21.8	17.7	18.9	24.2	19.4	13.3	19.4	26.9	14.9	17.5	0.0	16.4
Sometimes	48.9	56.3	59.2	46.2	20.9	64.7	44.0	50.8	61.3	34.9	49.9	19.5	53.3	40.5
Always	31.1	19.4	18.9	36.2	60.2	11.1	36.6	35.9	19.4	38.2	35.2	63.0	46.7	43.1
Institutions with contract systems														
Never	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	4.9	0.0	11.4	3.0	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	8.5	6.3	0.0	5.4
Sometimes	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	0.0	6.8	37.9	11.4	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	0.0	14.6	70.5	23.5
Always	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	95.1	93.2	50.7	85.5	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	91.5	79.1	29.5	71.1
ITEM 9a: Does your institution have procedures under which a faculty member whose contract was not renewed or who was denied tenure may appeal?														
All institutions														
Yes	100.0	87.7	93.6	82.7	96.0	78.5	88.7	86.7	83.9	91.4	81.1	93.1	77.6	86.3
Institutions with tenure systems														
Yes	100.0	87.7	93.6	82.1	94.0	96.6	88.7	86.7	83.9	91.4	80.7	93.2	95.2	87.1
Institutions with contract systems														
Yes	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	93.5	100.0	44.8	88.3	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	13.6	7.1	60.3	18.7

TABLE 4 (Continued)

ITEM	August 1974 Survey UNIVERSITIES Public	Private	COLLEGES Public 4-Year	Private 4-Year	Public 2-Year	Private 2-Year	ALL INSTITUTIONS	ITEM	April 1972 Survey UNIVERSITIES Public	Private	COLLEGES Public 4-Year	Private 4-Year	Public 2-Year	Private 2-Year	ALL INSTITUTIONS
ITEM 9b: Approximately how often have any of these procedures been used since September 1972?								How often have any of these procedures been used since September 1969?							
All institutions								All institutions							
None	11.6	15.1	26.6	49.6	66.1	69.9	50.7	None	26.1	23.1	33.3	52.7	63.5	82.1	53.9
1	3.5	6.0	12.8	16.0	16.2	8.5	14.3	1	18.0	23.1	20.0	24.6	9.6	6.3	17.0
2-3	19.8	24.6	14.8	26.2	11.1	2.8	17.4	2-3	26.1	19.2	20.3	17.4	19.0	4.2	17.8
4-10	45.3	43.2	26.4	6.8	5.4	2.0	11.3	4-10	27.0	19.1	16.3	4.7	6.4	7.4	8.6
11+	14.2	4.5	8.0	0.1	1.2	0.0	2.3	11+	0.0	11.5	10.0	0.6	1.5	0.0	2.4
No response	5.7	6.5	11.5	1.3	0.0	16.8	3.9	No response	2.7	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Institutions with tenure systems								Institutions with tenure systems							
None	11.6	15.1	26.6	50.8	64.8	73.0	48.8	None	26.1	23.1	33.3	52.7	56.4	81.1	50.4
1	3.5	6.0	12.8	14.1	17.8	3.5	13.4	1	18.0	23.1	20.0	23.1	6.8	5.0	16.4
2-3	19.8	24.6	14.8	26.4	10.6	0.0	18.1	2-3	26.1	19.2	20.3	19.5	25.3	5.0	19.9
4-10	45.3	43.2	26.4	7.1	5.0	2.5	12.5	4-10	27.0	19.1	16.3	5.0	9.4	8.8	10.1
11+	14.2	4.5	8.0	0.2	1.8	0.0	2.7	11+	0.0	11.5	10.0	0.7	2.2	0.0	2.8
No response	5.7	6.5	11.5	1.3	0.0	21.0	4.6	No response	2.7	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3
Institutions with contract systems								Institutions with contract systems							
None	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	29.8	68.6	57.3	61.6	None	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	52.9	78.8	87.1	75.5
1	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	45.0	13.3	28.5	19.5	1	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	47.1	15.7	12.9	20.4
2-3	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	22.5	12.0	14.2	13.8	2-3	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	0.0	5.5	0.0	4.1
4-6	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	2.7	6.1	0.0	5.0								

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

Sampling and Weighting Procedures

The sampling and reporting unit for this survey was the institution. The relevant population consisted of the 3,022 colleges and universities listed in Education Directory 1973-74.[1] The population was stratified into 37 cells as indicated in Table A1. Response frequencies from each institution were weighted by the appropriate cell weight: the ratio of the number of institutions in the population to the number of responding institutions in the sample for the given cell.

These stratification cells are grouped into seven reporting categories: public universities, private universities, public four-year colleges, private four-year colleges, public two-year colleges, private two-year colleges, and all institutions. The finer stratification within these reporting categories permits more exact control for size, selectivity and, in the case of the four-year private colleges, for control (nonsectarian, Catholic, other sectarian). Table A2 shows the distribution of respondents and of the population among the seven reporting categories.

These sampling, weighting, and reporting procedures parallel those used in the 1972 HEP survey on tenure and contract practices.[2] Consequently, data from the two surveys provide a basis for comparing national trends over the past two years with regard to tenure and contract systems.

---

[1] Education Directory 1973-74: Higher Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1974.

[2] For more detail, see W. T. Furniss, "Faculty Tenure and Contract Systems: Current Practice," ACE Special Report, July 27, 1972. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

TABLE A1

HIGHER EDUCATION PANEL

Distribution of Population and Panel Members by Stratification Categories

Cell Number	Stratification Design for Sampling	Panel (N=644)	Population (N=3022)
	PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES		
	Selectivity:		
1	Less than 550	51	56
2	550-599	27	29
3	600 or more	11	11
	PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES		
	Selectivity:		
4	Less than 550	12	16
5	550-599	13	14
6	600 or more	32	37
	FOUR-YEAR PUBLIC COLLEGES		
	Selectivity:		
7	Less than 450	21	96
8	450-499	12	66
9	500 or more	28	73
10	Unknown	33	174
	FOUR-YEAR PRIVATE NON-SECTARIAN COLLEGES		
	Selectivity:		
11, 15	Less than 500; Unknown	34	372
12	500-574	9	36
13	575 or more	30	48
14	650 or more	33	46
	FOUR-YEAR CATHOLIC COLLEGES		
	Selectivity:		
16	Less than 500	20	58
17	500-574	21	69
18	575 or more	14	36
19	Unknown	8	94
	FOUR-YEAR OTHER SECTARIAN COLLEGES		
	Selectivity:		
20	Less than 450	11	56
21	450-499	14	54
22	500-574	29	73
23	575 or more	37	54
24	Unknown	11	200
	TWO-YEAR PUBLIC COLLEGES		
	Selectivity:		
25, 26, 27	Less than 500	19	436
28	500-999	18	234
29	1000 or more	22	213

Distribution of Population and Panel Members by Stratification Categories (Con't)

Cell Number	Stratification Design for Sampling	Panel (N=644)	Population (N=3022)
	TWO-YEAR PRIVATE COLLEGES Enrollment:		
30,31	Less than 250	16	177
32	250-499	13	43
33	500 or more	6	28
	PREDOMINANTLY BLACK COLLEGES		
34	Public Four-Year	9	37
35	Private Four-Year	15	52
36	Two-Year	7	22
37	INDEPENDENT MEDICAL SCHOOLS	8	12

TABLE A2

Unweighted and Weighted Number of
Institutions in Each Reporting Category

REPORTING CATEGORY	UNWEIGHTED NUMBER (RESPONDENTS)	WEIGHTED NUMBER (POPULATION ESTIMATES)
Public Universities	86	97
Private Universities	53	67
Public Four-year Colleges	96	451
Private Four-year Colleges	253	1255
Public Two-year Colleges	41	894
Private Two-year Colleges	20	258
All institutions	586	3022

APPENDIX B: 1974 Survey Questionnaire

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

Higher Education Panel Survey Number 22

Faculty Tenure and Contract Systems

In many of the questions below the phrase "full-time faculty" is used. This should be interpreted as referring to current full-time faculty members and other full-time staff members who hold faculty appointments (e.g., administrators). Specifically excluded from this definition are graduate students who act as teaching assistants or teaching fellows.

1. A full-time faculty member may be granted tenure at this institution:

   Yes___
   No ___ (If "no," skip to question #7)

2a. This institution has a probationary period for tenure:

   Yes___
   No ___ (If "no," skip to question #7)

b. Maximum length of probationary period for tenure: _____years

c. Maximum number of years of prior service accepted as part of the probationary period:

   _____years _____No prior service accepted

d. Typical length of contracts awarded a faculty member during the probationary period:

   First contract: _____years
   Succeeding contracts: _____years

e. Approximately what percent of those faculty members formally considered for tenure in the academic year 1973-74 actually received tenure? _____percent

f. Approximately what percent of renewable contracts (other than those in question 2e) expiring during the academic year 1973-74 were renewed? _____percent.

3. In what ranks may tenure be held? (Check as many as apply)

   Professor___ Instructor___
   Associate___ Other_____
   Assistant___ (Please Specify)

   If your faculty is unranked, check here ___.

4. Percentage of full-time faculty with tenure: _____percent.

5a. This institution has formally announced a goal or a numerical limit for the percentage of tenured faculty:

   Yes___
   No ___

b. If "yes," the limit is expressed as:

   A fixed percentage: _____percent
   A range of percentages: _____percent to _____percent
   Numerically unspecified___

6a. Between Spring 1972 and Spring 1974, the probationary period for tenure has been:
shortened____, lengthened___, not changed___

b. In the same period, have the tenure review procedures been altered?

Yes___
No ___

c. Is the tenure system currently under review for change on your campus?

Yes___
No ___

7. FOR THOSE INSTITUTIONS WITH ONLY TERM APPOINTMENT (CONTRACT) SYSTEMS
(Other institutions skip to question #8)

a. What has been the typical length of contracts?

First contract: _____years
Succeeding contracts: _____years

b. What percentage of those faculty whose contracts expired during the 1973-74 academic year were renewed? _____percent

c. Is your institution planning to establish a tenure system?

Yes___
No ___ (Continue to #8)

8. Does your institution give formal, written reasons to a faculty member who was denied tenure or whose contract (probationary or recurring term appointment) was not renewed?

Always____ Sometimes____ Never____

9a. Does your institution have procedures under which a faculty member whose contract was not renewed or who was denied tenure may appeal?

Yes___
No ___

b. If yes, approximately how often have any of these procedures been used since September 1972? _____Times

10a. Did your institution operate under a faculty collective bargaining contract during the 1973-74 academic year?

Yes___
No ___

b. If yes, with what organization was the bargaining agent affiliated?

AAUP___ NEA____ AFT____ Other_____
(Please Specify)

Thank you for your cooperation.
Please return this form by August 14, 1974.

TO: HIGHER EDUCATION PANEL
AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION
ONE DUPONT CIRCLE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036

PERSON COMPLETING FORM_____
OFFICE_____
PHONE_____

Other Reports of the Higher Education Panel
American Council on Education

Blandford, B. and Dutton, D. **Survey of First-Year Graduate and Postdoctoral Enrollment in Science and Engineering.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 1, August, 1971.

Blandford, B. and Dutton, D. **Research Support for Science Faculty.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 2, November, 1971.

Astin, A., Blandford, B., and Mahn, T. **Freshman Class Vacancies in Fall 1971 and Recent Trends in Enrollment of Minority Freshmen.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 3, February, 1972.

Changes in Graduate Programs in Science and Engineering 1970–72 and 1972–1974. Science Resources Studies Highlights. Washington: National Science Foundation, July, 1972.

Blandford, B. and Sell, C. **Enrollment of Junior-Year Students (1970 and 1971).** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 5, April, 1972.

Trexler, J. and Blandford, B. **What College Presidents Are Reading.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 6, March, 1972.

Trexler, J. and Kent, L. **Commercial Theme-Writing Services.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 7, June, 1972.

Furniss, W. T. **Faculty Tenure and Contract Systems: Current Practice.** ACE Special Report, July, 1972.

Bayer, A. E. and Astin, A. W. **War Protest on U.S. Campuses During April, 1972.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 9, May, 1972.

Blandford, B. A. and Trexler, J. C. **Expected First-Year Graduate Enrollment in Science and Engineering, Fall 1972.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 10, August, 1972.

Blandford, B. A. **Student Participation on Institutional Governing Boards.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 11, October, 1972.

Dutton, J. E. and Blandford, B. A. **Enrollment of Junior-Year Students (1971 and 1972).** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 12, April, 1973.

Dutton, J. E. **Courses and Enrollment in Ethnic/Racial Studies.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 14, August, 1973.

Dutton, J. E. and Jenkins, M. D. **The Urban Involvement of Colleges and Universities.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 15, August, 1973.

Dutton, J. E. and El-Khawas, E. H. **Production of Doctorates in Selected Fields, 1972–1975.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 16, April, 1974.

Dutton, J. E. **First-Year Enrollment for Masters or Higher Degrees, Fall 1973.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 17, April, 1974.

El-Khawas, E. H. and Kinzer, J. L. **The Impact of Office of Education Student Assistance Programs, Fall 1973.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 18, April, 1974.

El-Khawas, E. H. and Kinzer, J. L. **Enrollment of Minority Graduate Students at Ph.D. Granting Institutions.** Higher Education Panel Report No. 19, August, 1974.

El-Khawas, E. H. **College and University Facilities: Expectations of Space and Maintenance Needs for Fall 1974.** Higher Education Panel Report No. 20, September, 1974.

Kinzer, J. L. and El-Khawas, E. H. **Compensation Practices for Graduate Research Assistants: A Survey of Selected Doctoral Institutions.** Higher Education Panel Report No. 21, October, 1974.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Single copies of the above reports may be obtained from the Higher Education Panel, American Council on Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036.